

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	PPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,552	03/29/2004		Efraim Atad	27616	8284
7590 11/15/2007 Martin D. Moynihan				EXAMINER	
PRTSI, Inc.			TAYLOR, JOSHUA D		
P.O. Box 16446 Arlington, VA 22215				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
<i>3</i> ,				4157	
			·		
				MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
				11/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/810,552	ATAD ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Josh Taylor	4157					
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address					
Period for Reply	UVIC CET TO EVDIDE AN	AONTH(S) OR THIRTY (20) DAVS					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a nd will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI ute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	,						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application	on.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdo	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	lar alastian requirement						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	vor election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- · · ·						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
11) Ine oath or declaration is objected to by the	examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action of form P10-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bure	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/810,552

Art Unit: 4157

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent; or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English.

 Claims (1, 4-9, 12-15) rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reisman, US 2004/0031058 A1.

Regarding claim 1, Reisman discloses as claimed:

A wide area network for bi-directional transmission between a plurality of user nodes and a central source node, at least some of the user nodes comprising rooftop video broadcast receiving installations modified with a terrestrial bi-directional antenna and network transmission support electronics (paragraph [0150] lines 6-14, fig. 1).

Regarding claim 4:

The wide area network of claim 1, wherein said rooftop video broadcast receiving installations are satellite receiving installations (paragraph [0090], lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 5:

The wide area network of claim 1, wherein said rooftop video broadcast receiving installations are terrestrial broadcast receiving installations (paragraph [0090], lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 6:

A wide area network system, comprising: a central source node, a plurality of base nodes connected via cable infrastructure to said central node, and a plurality of user nodes, at least some of the user nodes comprising rooftop video broadcast receiving installations modified with a terrestrial bi-directional antenna and network transmission support electronics (paragraphs [0090], [0150]).

Regarding claim 7:

The wide area network system of claim 6, wherein the cable infrastructure is hybrid fiber coax (HFC) infrastructure (paragraph [0085], line 6).

Regarding claim 8:

The wide area network system of claim 6, wherein a wide area network transmission standard is used over said cable infrastructure (paragraph [0087]).

Regarding claim 9:

The wide area network system of claim 8; where said transmission standard is at least one of IEEE 802.16 standard or the IEEE 802.20 standard (paragraph [0085], lines 19-20).

Regarding claim 12:

The wide area network system of claim 6, wherein said rooftop video broadcast receiving installations are satellite receiving installations (paragraph [0090], lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 13:

The wide area network system of claim 6, wherein said rooftop video broadcast receiving installations are terrestrial broadcast receiving installations (paragraph [0090], lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 14:

A hybrid cable and wireless bidirectional transmission network comprising a wireless network part and a cable part and wherein a wide area network transmission standard is used over both said wireless network part and said cable part (paragraphs [0085]-[0087]).

Regarding claim 15:

The hybrid cable and wireless bidirectional transmission network of claim 14, wherein said transmission standard is at least one of IEEE 802.16 standard or the IEEE 802.20 standard (paragraph [0085], lines 19-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in <u>Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966)</u>, that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows: (See MPEP Ch. 2141)

- a. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art;
- b. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue;
- c. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and
- d. Evaluating evidence of secondary considerations for indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. Claims (2-3, 10-11) rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being unpatentable over Reisman in view of Kalika et al, US 20070054670.

Regarding claim 2:

The wide area network of claim 1, wherein at least some of said user nodes comprise support for hotspot functionality, thereby to allow mobile

communication devices to access said wide area network system.

Reisman does not teach of nodes comprising support for hotspot functionality. In an analogous art, Kalika teaches of nodes comprising support for hotspot functionality (paragraph [0092], lines 1-6).

Page 6

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify Reisman to include hotspot, as taught by Kalika, for the benefit of user knowing the areas of hotspot where user LAN and WAN would be active.

Regarding claim 3:

The wide area network of claim 2, Reisman teaches the wide area network of claim 2 wherein said support for hotspot functionality substantially comprises standard IEEE 802.11 (paragraph [0115], lines 11-17).

Regarding claim 10:

The wide area network system of claim 6, wherein at least some of said user nodes comprise support for hotspot functionality, thereby to allow mobile communication devices to access said wide area network system is rejected on the same grounds as Claim 2.

Regarding claim 11:

The wide area network system of claim 10, wherein said support for hotspot

functionality substantially conforms to IEEE standard 802.11 is rejected on the same grounds as Claim 3.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

List prior art cited for the record but not used in Office Action, including a short description (cite a couple of sentences from the abstract of reference)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Josh Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 270-3755. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5pm, M-F, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vu Le can be reached on (571) 272-7332. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/810,552 Page 8

Art Unit: 4157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Josh Taylor

SUPERVISORY PATENT PXAMINER